

Application Number 09/653,701
Amendment dated December 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 6, 2005

R-E-M-A-R-K-S

Claims 3-7, and 9-12 are now pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 8 are hereby cancelled without prejudice and claims 11 and 12 are hereby introduced. Claims 3 and 6 are amended to change their claim dependency. Claims 3, 6, 9 and 10 are amended to adjust some of the terms to comply with new claim 11. The Applicant submits that no new matter is introduced.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3-10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable in view of Frink et al. (US Patent N°6,678,002).

The Applicant believes new independent claim 11 is responsive to the Examiner's rejection. The Applicant submits hereinbelow some of the differences between Frink et al. and the claimed invention.

First, the Applicant submits that the HD video system of Frink et al. is not the equivalent of the claimed graphics chip. Frink et al. discloses, as stated by the Examiner, an HD video system 104 which is described according to Figs. 1A to 1F. According to Frink et al., the HD video system 104 includes an HD data router, a resizer, and codec. These elements are not found in the claimed graphics chip. The claimed graphics chip comprises "*a 2D graphics engine and a 3D rendering engine respectively for providing 2D and 3D functions used for said video editing of said at least two real-time uncompressed digital video streams*". Obviously, HD video system 104 does not provide these components or their functionality. Furthermore, there is no suggestion in Frink et al. to modify the HD video system 104 to provide such corresponding 2D and 3D functions.

Second, Frink et al. does not disclose an apparatus which comprises a video decoder, a codec "*for providing at least two real-time uncompressed digital video streams*", and a video encoder. The Applicant points out that these are separate elements and that the codec 216 of Frink et al. does not act as the claimed video encoder. Furthermore, Frink et al. does not show an encoder.

Third, Frink et al. does not disclose a time division multiplexed bus for transferring data from the codec to the two video inputs of the graphics chip.

These differences are further highlighted in the following table.

Application Number 09/653,701
Amendment dated December 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 6, 2005

| Claim 1 | Frink | Comment |
|-------------------------------|---------------------|---|
| Graphics Chip | HD Video System 104 | Not the same. Graphics chip is a specialized (2D and 3D functions), stand alone item. HD Video System comprises many discrete chips (resizer, codec, router, etc.). |
| Encoder | - | Not present. |
| Decoder | Codec 216 | Not the same. |
| Time Division Multiplexed Bus | - | Not present. |

The Applicant therefore believes that claim 11 is not anticipated nor is it obvious and is therefore patentable in view of the cited prior art.

The Applicant further believes that claims 3-7, 9, 10, and 12 are patentable in view of the cited prior art as they are dependent from a claim which is believed to be patentable.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that claims 3-7 and 9-12 are allowable over the prior art and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorne TROTTIER *et al.*

By:



C. Marc Benoît (Reg. No. 50,200)

Agent of Record

Customer No. 020988

Ogilvy Renault LLP

1600 - 1981 McGill College Avenue

Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2Y3

Tel: (514) 847-4462


Application Number 09/653,701
Amendment dated December 6, 2005
Reply to Office action of June 6, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the
Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

C. Marc BENOÎT, Reg. No. 50,200

Name of person signing certification


Signature


Date